



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CASES ON CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. Part III. With Notes by James Bradley Thayer, LL.D., Weld Professor of Law at Harvard University. Cambridge : Charles W. Sever. 1894. pp. x, 486 (945-1431).

This part is now out, and Part IV. is expected to be out in the early part of 1895. This contains valuable selections of cases and authorities on Eminent Domain and on Taxation. *Minot v. Winthrop*, the Massachusetts decision sustaining the collateral inheritance tax, makes its first appearance in print, from a certified copy, on page 1422. R. W. H.

DANIELL'S CHANCERY PLEADING AND PRACTICE. Sixth American Edition. By John M. Gould, Ph. D. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1894. 3 vols. 8vo. pp. cxxxi, viii, xxxii, 2732.

BLISS ON CODE PLEADING. Third Edition. By E. F. Johnson, B. S. L. L. M. St. Paul: West Publishing Co. 1894. 8vo. pp. xxxv, 809.

In these two works are represented widely different methods of treatment, with different objects and ends in view. The Daniell, in response to the practitioner's demand, is ponderous, full, almost all-comprehensive in its nature; while the Bliss, as becomes a text-book for students, is simpler and less exhaustive, aiming to deal rather with the underlying principles than the minutiae of code law.

This fundamental distinction, moreover, is not less accentuated in the latest editions of these works than in the past. Three years of nearly constant research and investigation have been devoted, so it is stated, to the task of making this edition of Chancery Pleading complete and fully abreast of the times; and the result is evidenced by useful additions (forms, precedents, etc.), a vastly enlarged, perhaps exhaustive collection of new authorities, and a marked extension of the encyclopedic character of the work.

In the new edition of Bliss, on the other hand, a different task has been attempted, — *i. e.* to add to the value of the book for the purposes of the student rather than for those of the practising lawyer. To accomplish this a variety of means has been used: short, terse statements of principles have been placed before the sections discussing them, leading cases have been cited in the notes, new forms added, and topics of recent development considered and discussed.

Looked at from its own point of view, each new edition appears to have been faithful to the objects of its work, and not unsuccessful in carrying them into existence. D. A. E.

THE LAW OF EVIDENCE. By H. C. Underhill, LL. B. Chicago: T. H. Flood & Co. 1894. 8vo. pp. ccii, 567.

This is a brief treatise primarily intended for students. It follows the method and teachings of the leading text-books, but does not show any familiarity with the recent monographs and articles that have helped so much to give the rules of evidence their proper formulation. Such subjects as the parol evidence rule, the construction of written instruments, *res gestæ*, and the "best evidence" rule, receive brief and by no means